	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Interview Summary	09/774,577	OOSAWA, AKIRA
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Seyed Azarian	2624	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) *Seyed Azarian*.   (3)_____.

(2) *Laura Moskowitz*.   (4)_____.

Date of Interview: *10 April 2006*.

Type: a)☒ Telephonic   b)☐ Video Conference
         c)☐ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant   2)☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)☐ Yes   e)☐ No.
         If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: *13*.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f)☐ was reached.   g)☐ was not reached.   h)☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: *See attach paper* .

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

_____
Examiner's signature, if required

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
PTOL-413 (Rev. 04-03)   **Interview Summary**   Paper No. 20060409

In light of the personal interview on April 4, 2006 with applicants representative (Mrs. Laura Moskowltz). Examiner agreed to reconsider claim 13. After a further review the examiner concludes as mentioned in the previous office action, that Kano reference (U.S. 5,359,513), column 12, lines 44-68, clearly discloses the digital image input device supplies the same digitized image to each of the image memories 110, 120 (which referred as **past image**). Each of these memories has a first output, which is received, by RIO location. Image memory 120 has a second output, which is received by subtraction calculator 210. Local **matching is performed in calculator** 150, which output the **result** to generator 160 and calculation to memory 170, where the **result stored** in memory 190. A curve-fitting calculator 180 receives the output of memory 170 and performs the curve fitting function described above.

The result of this process is stored in memory and **subsequently displayed** to an output display device **for viewing by the radiologist**. It is obvious that processed image that is stored in the memory must be **retrieved (fetched)** in order to be view by the radiologist. Thus Kano does teach the claim limitation as recited in claim 13.

Seyed Azarian

Patent Examiner

Group Art Unit 2624

April 10, 2006